



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/807,070	07/05/2001	John W. Sims	39786/MEG	2377
23363 7590 02/28/2008 CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP PO BOX 7068 PASADENA, CA 91109-7068			EXAMINER LANEAU, RONALD	
			ART UNIT 3714	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/28/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/807,070  
Filing Date: July 05, 2001  
Appellant(s): SIMS ET AL.

**MAILED**  
**FEB 28 2003**  
**GROUP 3700**

---

Tom H. Dao  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 02/06/07 appealing from the Office action mailed 07/26/06.

Art Unit: 3714

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

6,067,530	BROOKS, JR et al	5-2000
5,883,371	MEEKER	3-1999

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooks, Jr et al (US 6,067,530) in view of Meeker (US 5,883,371).

As per claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19 and 24-26, Brooks discloses a method of providing a communication interface for coupling a point-of-sale system 38 to a cash management system 24 for providing communication between the P.O.S. system and the cash management system (fig. 2A, 39), providing software on the cash management system to permit operation of the cash management system over a communication link and providing software on the P.O.S. system to permit control of the cash management system over the internet (fig. 1A, electronic drop safe), a method wherein providing software on the P.O.S. system to permit control of the cash management system over the communication link (fig. 2A, 39) and providing software on the P.O.S. system to permit control of the cash management system over the internet (fig. 1A, electronic drop safe). Brooks does not disclose a cash management system including a cash dispensing function but Meeker discloses a cash management including a digital deposit dispensing safe (see abs., fig.1).

Art Unit: 3714

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the cash management including a digital deposit and dispensing safe as taught by Meeker into the system of Brooks because it would eliminate the need for the store manager having to manually verify each cashier and also enable the store manager to spend less time counting money and more time servicing customers.

As per claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, and 20-23, Brooks discloses a method of providing a communication interface for coupling a point-of-sale system 38 to a cash management system 24 for providing communication between the P.O.S. system and the cash management system (fig. 2A, 39), providing software on the cash management system to permit operation of the cash management system over a communication link and providing software on the P.O.S. system to permit control of the cash management system over the internet (fig. 1A, electronic drop safe), a method wherein providing software on the P.O.S. system to permit control of the cash management system over the communication link (fig. 2A, 39) and providing software on the P.O.S. system to permit control of the cash management system over the internet (fig. 1A, electronic drop safe), a cash machine system 28 over a communication link 39 including providing a graphical user interface 38. Brooks does not disclose a cash management system including a cash dispensing function but Meeker discloses a cash management including a digital deposit dispensing safe (see abs., fig.1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the cash management including a digital deposit and dispensing safe as taught by Meeker into the system of Brooks for the same reasons given in previous claims.

Art Unit: 3714

**(10) Response to Argument**

Applicant's arguments filed 2/6/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that there is no suggestion or motivation to combine the references. In response to Applicant's arguments, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Applicant further argues that Brooks and Meeker fail to disclose the recited limitation feature "providing a user interface software on the P.O.S. system which emulates the user interface of the cash management system." In response to Applicant's arguments, Brooks does disclose such feature (see rejection above for specific citations of column and lines). Therefore, Claims 1-26 are finally rejected.

**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,



Art Unit: 3714

/Ronald Laneau/

Primary Examiner

Conferees:

  
Richard Chilcot

  
  
Robert Olszewski